

protect and take care of each other's interests, bend rules for each other, but when it comes to the poor it's the back of the hand or the heel.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And I think that is very regrettable. The Legislature often behaves like a pride of lions when it's dealing with a flock of sheep. So we show our strength and our muscles on those who don't need to be battered, who cannot put up a resistance, who are no threat to us. We argue about nickels and pennies after giving away the treasury to those who have no need. I think the \$7 increase that Senator Johnson's amendment is recommending is not going to break this treasury and it's not going to hurt this state. And I hope that there will be enough votes to attach this amendment to the bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, I'll be as brief as I can. Number one, I want to re-emphasize again, this is a maximum level. This is not the actual funding level. What you do is you set a standard of need and under that need you can set any level of ADC payment you want. You can reduce, you can increase, you just cannot go above that maximum level. If you don't do the Johnson amendment, then you tie the hands of the Appropriations Committee and this Legislature in the future next year or whenever to make even a small \$7 additional adjustment. Let's say next year the money is in, that things are going good and again we know the demand is there for the ADC so you want to make an adjustment, Appropriations Committee feels it's necessary. They cannot do anything until a bill is passed to allow them to do that. By adopting this amendment you allow the \$300 maximum, you allow the flexibility and if you want to you can vote against the funding on the A bill part of it. I would recommend you vote for it, but if you vote for this you're not bound to vote for the appropriation part of it. You are not bound in the A bill to fund it, but at least you'd provide the flexibility to allow the Appropriations Committee to deal with this issue next year if they so desire to do that. That would be their option just as it was this year because we had the 293 maximum, we were at \$280, they saw the need and they increased it \$13. Okay, so first off, practically this costs you nothing to vote for this up to \$300. It's a flexibility argument. I can't see why you'd at least give them that much flexibility to